



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,100	07/06/2004	Katsuo Sugahara	09852/0201465-US0	5559
7278	7590	09/27/2006	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C.			ALEXANDER, MICHAEL P	
P. O. BOX 5257			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			PAPER NUMBER	

1742

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/501,100	SUGAHARA, KATSUO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael P. Alexander	1742	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/03/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim(s) 2-26 is/are pending. Claims 4-26 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazuo (JP 06-128671).

Regarding claim 2, Kazuo teaches (0001, abstract, Tables 1-2) a nickel based alloy comprising: 38-45% Cr; 0.5-5.0%, in total, of one or more of Mo, W and V; up to 0.1% Mg; up to 1.0% Mn; up to 1.0% Si; up to 0.07% C; which overlaps with the claimed amounts of Cr, Mo, Mg, Mn, Si and C, which is prima facie evidence of obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05 I. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the desired amounts of the elements from the ranges disclosed by Kazuo because Kazuo teaches the same utility throughout the disclosed range.

With respect to the claimed nitrogen range in claim 1, the Examiner notes that all of the disclosed embodiments have the claimed range of nitrogen, which would be evidence that Kazuo anticipated the claimed nitrogen range or evidence of the obviousness of the claimed range of nitrogen.

With respect to the recitation of having "excellent stress corrosion cracking resistance relative to supercritical water environments" in claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the alloy of Kazuo would inherently have such properties because Kazuo teaches the substantially same composition as that of the claimed invention. See MPEP 2112.01 I.

Regarding claim 3, Kazuo teaches (0001) forming the alloy into a thick plate, round bar or pipe, which would be members for supercritical water process reaction apparatus.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suarez et al. (US 6,106,643) in view of any one of Bieber et al. (US 3,619,182), Olson (US 3,619,183), Baldwin et al. (US 3,918,964) or Peterson (US 3,984,239), on the same grounds as stated in the Office Action of 9 June 2006.

Double Patenting

Claims 2-3 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of copending Application No. 10/546,130, on the same grounds as stated in the Office Action of 9 June 2006.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, applicant argues that the alloy of Suarez would not have "excellent corrosion resistance relative to supercritical water environments containing inorganic acids" because Suarez teaches the presence of calcium. In response, the Examiner notes that the applicant has presented no evidence that the presence of calcium would render the alloy of Suarez to not have excellent corrosion resistance. See MPEP 2145 I. Attorney arguments do not take the place of evidence in the record.

Second, applicant argues that Suarez does not teaches a suppression effect suppressing deterioration of corrosion resistance due to aging in an operating temperature range a supercritical water process reaction apparatus. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "suppression effect") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Third, applicant argues that Suarez does not teach a long term corrosion resistance. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "long term corrosion resistance") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification

Art Unit: 1742

are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-8558. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


mpa


ROY KING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700